A Plan for Permanent Arab-Israeli Peace, Pps. 1-2

Words Neither Israel Nor the World Should Ignore Though Spoken In Defeat

"The forces of imperialism imagine that Abdel Nasser is their enemy. I want it to be clear to them that it is the entire Arab nation and not Gamal Abdel Nasser. The forces hostile to the Arab nationalist movement always try to picture it as Abdel Nasser's empire. That is not true, for the hope for Arab unity began before Gamal Abdel Nasser. It will remain after Gamal Abdel Nasser."
—From the speech offering his resignation June 9

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. XV, NO. 22 JUNE 19, 1967 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

The Place for LBJ To Practice The Reconciliation He Preaches

There is no doubt that Johnson's stock has risen with the end of the Arab-Israel war. It has risen because he did not intervene militarily. All the sensitive political seismographs in Washington indicate that the country is fed up with unilateral interventions, with trying to be the world's policeman and indeed with the whole conception—so dear to the Pentagon and the State Department—of imposing a *Pax Americana* upon a refractory globe. The overwhelming mood is that one Vietnam is enough. Just as the Vietnamese war has overextended U.S. military power so it has also exhausted the American people's tolerance for foreign adventures. It may well be that Johnson did not practice gunboat diplomacy in the Arab-Israeli crisis because he is short of "gunboats"—U.S. naval power was on the wrong side of Suez to be effective, U.S. airpower elsewhere has been stripped of pilots and planes by Vietnam, and it would have taken at least a partial mobilization to find troops for the Middle East. Whatever the reason, Johnson for the first time acted like the dove he claimed to be in the Goldwater campaign.

VC Too Strong For Us In Two-Thirds of Vietnam

Perhaps he may be encouraged now, despite Rusk's rigidity, to apply in the Far East the restraint he showed in the Middle East. The White House is busy preaching reconciliation to the Israelis and the Arabs. It ought to set an example by practicing what it preaches. The quarrel between Hanoi and Washington is a minor scratch compared to the deep wound of the Arab-Israeli feud. We want the Arabs to recognize realities in the Middle East. Why not recognize a few realities on our own in the Far East? Our failure after so many years of effort, so many billions of dollars and a half million troops was evident again last week when elections for hamlet chiefs in South Vietnam ended with the admission (*New York Times,* June 13, p. 4, city ed) that voting had to be limited to only one-third of the country's hamlets! The Viet Cong were too strong in two-thirds of the countryside. Could there be a more striking indication of how deep-rooted and widespread is the rebellion we have been trying to crush? Is it not time to recognize this reality, to make peace, and to stop burning up Vietnam, North and South, in our blind and stubborn frustration? The relief with which the country has greeted the Israeli victory in the Middle East is as nothing compared to the relief it would register if there were a Vietnam cease-fire. And the task of making a stable peace in the Middle East would be made easier if we stopped outraging the whole Third World of Asia and Africa in Vietnam.

Some Sobering Figures

Two polls on the Middle East, one by Louis Harris in the Washington Post June 11 and the other by Gallup in the same paper June 12 deserve close attention from American Jewry. Both polls were taken before fighting ended. Both show sympathy for Israel but overwhelming opposition to U.S. military intervention in its favor. Gallup showed 55% pro-Israel only 4% pro-Arab; Harris showed 41% pro-Israel, 1% pro-Arab but 48% with no strong feelings either way and 15% undecided; 63% thought the Arabs wanted to start the war, only 16% Israel. But Harris reported 56% opposed to sending U.S. troops and 77% for working through the UN. Gallop reported 41% for staying out of the conflict and only 16% for aiding Israel. Harris noted that those most militant about escalating the war in Vietnam (lower income, Catholic and Southerners) are least willing to commit troops to Israel. On the other hand Harris showed a 73% Jewish vote for sending troops. It is clear that the country while pro-Israel wants no more foreign adventures at this time. The good-will for Israel may easily be destroyed by pushing too hard for U.S. action in its favor which risks war.

Proposing An Arab-Israeli Confederation in Palestine

Until 1922 the territory now known as Transjordan was part of Palestine; the British lopped it off to create the Arab Kingdom Hussein inherited. Hussein's grandfather, King Abdullah, annexed the West bank of the Jordan and part of Jerusalem in 1948 in tacit agreement with the Israelis. Both sides preferred this solution to the establishment of an Arab State in Palestine as envisaged in the original partition plan voted by the United Nations in 1947. A return to the main idea of this plan may offer a way out for both sides. The original plan called for an Arab State and a Jewish State in Palestine west of the Jordan, the two to be linked in a customs union, with a common currency, joint communications and a joint economic board of 3 Arabs, 3

(Continued on Page Two)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

An Opportunity to Build A Life in Common for Arab and Israeli

(Continued from Page One)

Jews and 3 UN members appointed by the UN Economic and Social Council. This board would handle development, irrigation, land reclamation and soil conservation. The plan came to naught because while the Jews already had a state in all but name, the Arabs opposed the whole plan and hoped instead to drive the Jews out of the country altogether in the 1948 fighting. Most of the Arabs were driven out instead.

Now most of these refugees are back in a Palestine once more united by the Israeli victories. Zionist literature has dwelt on "the ingathering of the exiles". Suddenly Israel finds that its armies have gathered in the Arab exiles of Palestine. In this reunited Palestine, the Arabs are concentrated just about where they would have been by the original partition plan; in the Gaza strip, on the West bank north and south of Jerusalem and in Central Galilee (which Israel had seized in the 1948 fighting but in that area without dislodging the bulk of the Arab population). The Arab refugees are back. The Israeli out of sheer necessity are asking the Arab Mayors, police and other municipal officials to stay on the job on the West Bank where most of the Arabs live. Moshe Dayan in his interview on *Face the Nation* June 11 spoke cryptically of Arab "autonomy" in those areas. He has on several occasions spoken vaguely of "confederation."

From Threat To Shield

Why not make a virtue of necessity by offering to set up an Arab state in these areas, linked in a confederation with Israel and perhaps also with Transjordan? Why not do it with grace and magnanimity instead of grudgingly and in this context provide reparation and resettlement? Why not build a bi-national Palestine of this kind which could be a bridge to the Arab world and a means of permanent reconciliation?

To return to the Grand Design of the original partition plan would give Israel the security of strategic borders in a reunited Palestine. It would turn the refugees from a threat to a shield, from enemies to allies. It would right the wrong done these refugees in 1948. It would make Israel a collaborator in Arab development rather than a neo-colonial intruder. It would open to Israel acceptance in the Third World of Asia and Africa where its only safe future lies. If the General Assembly now meets, it will be hostile to Israel. The bulk of the world's colored people see the Israelis as a belated Western intruder, practicing a new colonialism and treating the Arabs as "natives". That view and that sense of identification with the Arabs create deadly difficulties for Israel.

All that could be changed if world Jewry and Israel pitched in now to create a viable life for the Arab refugees in reunited Palestine; offered them self-government in the Arab areas and joint institutions with the Israeli for the whole of the country. All the problems of access to Aqaba and of viable frontiers would be transformed in such a setting. It would also be a solution worthy of the best Jewish traditions and setting a new pattern in human relations. Can Jewry and Israel rise to so great a challenge? Can they see the "recapture" of the Arab refugees not as a burden but as an opportunity for a unique and rewarding act of statesmanship?

Paul Goodman on Israel and the Arabs

Dear I. F. Stone: **I am disturbed by your sentence, "In the 10 years since (1956), instead of bringing about a final peace between Israel and its Arab neighbors, the superpowers supplied arms for the new outbreak." This is true, but it too easily lets Israel and the Arabs off the hook. As a Jew, I am concerned about the immoral neglect by Israel.**

Out of historical need, the Jews invaded the region under the British. In the time of Hitler and immediately afterward, they had no psychological alternative than massive immigration; and Israel has been an indispensable refuge for North African and Arabian Jewish exiles. Despite injustices, there is nothing immoral in these necessities. But it has been grossly immoral for Israel to have neglected for 20 years the plight of the displaced Arabs and not to have taken all initiatives for a settlement with its Arab neighbors, however painful and despite rebuffs. In some respects, the Israel attitude toward the Arabs has been miserably reminiscent of the American treatment of the Indians. It was just this kind of self-centered statism that Buber warned against.

—Paul Goodman

How Mendes-France Saw the Middle Eastern Situation Before War Broke Out

"I have received your appeal. I share your anguish in these grave hours. How could one not be moved when a country, member of the UN, sees even its right to exist contested? When the life of a people is threatened by those who surround it? I would like still to hope however that a peaceful and honorable solution, respecting the vital interests of Israel, may be found.

"For 20 years it has been explained that the internal rivalries of the Arab world constitute an almost insurmountable obstacle to the pacification of the Middle East. 'If I made peace with Israel,' one of them said recently, 'I would be denounced by all my neighbors as a traitor to a sacred cause, and overthrown by their demagogy.'

"But now circumstances—though truly in the worst conditions—have practically realized Arab political and military unity. Paradoxically the dialogue which was impossible yesterday is conceivable today. Not only on specific problems (Aqaba, the control of frontier zones, the fate of the refugees, military, de-escalation, etc.) but on the problems of Israel as a whole.

"It is a global negotiation between the Arab States, now joined, and Israel, that those responsible for the peace of the world should seek to bring about. This is the only way to an equitable settlement, inspired by the rights and dignity of all peoples, a settlement in which they may all find the tranquility and security they need for their development and progress.

"To this end is it too much to ask the governments concerned to end their invectives and incitements, and calm their people instead of whipping up hatreds it will later be difficult to control? And is it too much to ask the great powers to end the arms sales by which they constantly aggravate the dangers of war in the Middle East?

"It is in this spirit that I address you with the warmest wishes for the peace and security of Israel."

—Letter from Former Premier Pierre Mendes-France to Mapam, the Israeli Left Labor party in Le Monde *June 4-5*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Why the Peasants Prefer the Viet Cong to the Saigon Government

By John T. Wheeler

Saigon (AP)—"To the tillers belongs the soil." "Destroy the feudal land barons." "Food grown by the people's sweat belongs to the people, not the capitalist landlord." Throughout the underdeveloped lands of the world, Communists make powerful use of these and similar slogans in bidding for the popular support vital to any Vietnam-style insurgency.

The figures are subject to challenge, but the Viet Cong claims to have seized nearly 2.3 million acres from prosperous landlords and turned them over to the peasants. The power of the slogans is perhaps as great as the "No taxation without representation" that helped turn American colonialists into armed insurgents. One American source argues that the effect of the Viet Cong land reform has been more dramatic and meaningful than "1,000 Boston Tea Parties."

Little Done Since Diem Fell

Farmers make up 80 percent of Vietnam's population and without their support no meaningful victory is possible here. Despite Saigon claims of action in land reform, U.S. officials cite figures to indicate that Premier Nguyen Cao Ky has turned over only about 20,000 new acres during his nearly two years in office. The evidence is that little has been done about land reform since Diem fell in 1963.

Diem expropriated 229,000 acres from French estate owners and another 1.12 million acres from landlords who held in excess of 247 acres. He distributed much of the best land to government figures and those whose loyalty seemed important in the countryside. In all some 645,000 acres were passed out. Many men with large holdings split them among their families and turned over to the government mostly marginal or nonproductive land. Ky's regime has issued some 200,000 titles confirming Diem's reform. The recipients only had temporary title before. There are still about 800,000 acres of land to be sold from the Diem edicts before 1963. About half is rated as cultivable.

"What has never been but must now be recognized by the Vietnamese government is that only a real revolution in the countryside can bring victory over the Communists," an American source has commented.

Maj. Gen. Nguyen Duc Thang, head of the embattled pacification program, echoed this and said: "It is no good to try to tell the people that the Communists are bad. We must show them we can do more for them and give them a better life."

Ky is given good marks for intentions by some Americans. They point out that he must battle centuries-old mandarin-style economic exploitation in the countryside. The members of this society are powerful men and pay money in the right places to ensure that reforms don't threaten their way of life. These elements were strong enough to emasculate efforts to write tough land-reform legislation into Vietnam's new Constitution.

U.S. sources are not certain how much of the Communists' claimed 2.2 million acres really have been turned over to the peasants or how much they firmly control. The government has issued titles to thousands of acres of land in Viet Cong areas where the titles are worthless. Perhaps the Viet Cong do the same.

The Communists do not charge for the land as the government does, but they tax it heavily to keep their war machine in operation. The Communists in the main do not issue permanent titles. Theirs run for the duration of the war. One implied threat is that the land will be formed into collectives on the North Vietnamese pattern with state ownership after the war. Ho Chi Minh's home province of Nghe An revolted temporarily against the Hanoi regime because of its land policies. Few peasants in the south are aware of government land policies in Saigon, let alone those of North Vietnam.

Interviews with peasants in an area where the government recently distributed a batch of titles showed many feel that land reform is only for those with money or power. Most said they knew of no one who had actually received land. They were certain neither they nor their sons would ever get any.

The government sells its reformed land on an average for about $80 an acres, a sum few peasants could hope to amass under the present tenant farming system. Few realize that Saigon gives farmers 12 years to pay for the land and charges no interest. Despite a law setting rent ceilings at 25% of the annual crop, rents commonly are 30-50% or higher.

Not all this violates the spirit of the law. Most peasants are too poor to buy fertilizer and some have to eat their seed to stay alive. The landlord has to provide it, at a price, or the peasant can borrow money. Interest rates of 10% a month are common.

Billions of U.S. aid dollars since 1954 have altered little for the peasants. Half of the 7 million acres of farm land are worked by tenants. There is some running room in the land problem for many areas. The war has become so fierce that the peasants caught in the middle worry most about staying alive. But the issue is certain to flame anew.

An old Vietnamese saying holds, "He should own the land who rubs it between his hands each season."

Too Radical To Print?

The dispatch here printed is one of the most illuminating ever filed out of Saigon but it seems to have died on the spike of most U.S. news editors. We saw a bit of it buried in the shipping news on page 78 of the* New York Times, *June 6 and suspected it was part of a much longer story. A friendly editor on an AP paper obtained the full text for us and we thought readers would like to see it for themselves. It's worth filing for future reference.

With all due respect for Mr. Wheeler, he still misses the real point. To see it would be to apply a radical, even a Marxist, analysis, and this of course is taboo in respectable American journalism. The real point is that the Saigon government represents the Vietnamese landed gentry. The rigged system by which the Constituent Assembly was elected gave them control of the Constitution writing process and that is why Dr. Dan's proposal to give the land to the tenants tilling it was able to obtain only three votes. If the U.S. really backed land reform, it would seem as big a menace to the gentry as the Viet Cong itself, and indeed hardly distinguishable. Mr. Wheeler seems unaware that landlords have been riding back with our troops to recover their land and rents. The idea that you can carry on a "revolutionary program" while fighting a counter-revolutionary war on behalf of the landlords is nonsense. Even Mr. Wheeler does not see that.—IFS

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Not A Cooling Way to Start Off Another Racially Hot Summer

It is not a cooling preface to another hot summer that eight of the country's leading Negro ministers, including Martin Luther King, will now go to jail for five days in Birmingham and pay $50 fines as a result of a 5-to-4 decision by the Supreme Court last Monday. The decision upheld their convictions for contempt because they held mass demonstrations in Birmingham during the Easter week-end in 1963 in defiance of an injunction issued by the Alabama courts. These demonstrations, and the police brutality they protested, helped to bring about enactment of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, ending segregation in public accommodations.

Bull Connor Said No

The spectacle will not be made the sweeter for Negroes by the circumstances. There could hardly be a clearer case or arbitrary police and judicial action. When Rev. Fred L. Shuttlesworth, one of the eight, asked then Police Commissioner "Bull" Connor for a permit that worthy replied in his engaging fashion, "You will not get a permit to picket in Birmingham. I will picket you over to the city jail." Connor obtained an injunction forbidding them to demonstrate. The Ministers thereupon issued a statement saying, "This is raw tyranny under the guise of maintaing order" and announced that they would parade anyway, not to defy the law but "to purify the judicial system of the state of Alabama." The judicial system thereupon demonstrated its impurities by refusing to let them challenge the injunction as unconstitutional under the First and 14th Amendments. The courts held that the only issues were whether they had power to issue the injunction and whether the petitioners knowingly violated it. On this basis conviction was a foregone conclusion. This is exactly how labor leaders in strikes used to be "put away" in jail a half century ago under "temporary" labor injunctions *ex parte*, i.e. without a hearing. Both the Alabama courts and the Supreme Court majority, in upholding the convictions, fell back on a notorious labor decision of the pre-Norris-La Guardia Act era. This is the kind of precedent I can remember attacking more than 30 years ago in the successful campaign to outlaw labor injunctions. This is the weapon now trotted out against the Negro. Such ex parte "temporary" injunctions may now be used to restrict First Amendment rights. But Mr. Justice Black, though a lifelong champion of the First Amendment, chose "order" above liberty, and broke with his fellow liberals to make possible a 5-to-4 decision upholding the convictions. That is the most painful part of the story.

In much the same spirit Mr. Justice Black joined with Harlan and White in dissenting from the 6-to-3 decision by Mr. Justice Clark restricting police use of "bugging" devices. The issues are too complex for exposition in limited space but the motor force lay in the different emotions aroused. Black's dissent was emotional about the menace of crime. His old liberal comrade-in-arms Douglas turned up on the other side with a concurring opinion in which the anxieties were about the effect that electronic Big Brother practices could have on a free society. Even constitutional law has its hidden *de gustibus*.

It was a pleasure to have Black and Douglas together again dissenting in the Butts and Walker cases. Here they warned in Black's words "that the Court is getting itself in the same quagmire in the field of libel in which it is now helplessly struggling in the field of obscenity" i.e. by deciding every civil libel case "on the merits" instead simply of holding "that a law which seriously menaces the very life of press freedom violates the First Amendment."

We welcome with deep satisfaction the appointment of the first Negro to the U.S. Supreme Court and believe that Thurgood Marshall will serve both his race and his country with humanity and distinction.

From the Birmingham Case Dissents

"The rich can buy advertisements in newspapers, purchase radio or television time, and rent billboard space. Those less affluent are restricted to the use of handbills or petitions or parades or mass meetings . . . Even when an ordinance requires a permit to make a speech, to deliver a sermon, to picket, to parade, or to assemble, it need not be honored when it is invalid on its face . . . If a person must pursue his judicial remedy before he may speak, parade, or assemble, the occasion when protest is desired or needed will have become history and any later speech, parade or assembly will be futile or pointless."

—Douglas dissenting in the Birmingham cases June 12, with Warren, Brennan and Fortas concurring.

"We cannot permit fears of 'riots' and 'civil disobedience' generated by slogans like 'Black Power' to divert our attention from what is here at stake—not violence or the right of the State to control its streets and sidewalks, but the insulation of attack of ex parte orders . . . even when patently impermissible prior restraints on . . . First Amendment rights."

—Brennan for the same dissenting four Justices.

We Are Now Going on Every Other Week Schedule Until the End of July—The Next Issue Will be Dated July 3

I. F. Stone's Weekly 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington, D. C. 20015

Please renew (or enter) a sub for the enclosed $5:

Name .....

Street .....

City ..... Zip..... State.....

6/19/67

For the enclosed $5 send a gift sub to:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City ..... Zip..... State.....

Indicate if announcement wished ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly

5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20015

NEWSPAPER

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Second Class Postage Paid at Washington, D. C. Published every Monday except in August, the last week in December and the first week in January and Bi-Weekly during July at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N.W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U.S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $17 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED